

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,028	01/08/2001	Arnold L. Levine	03848.00061	4950
28315 7	10/28/2003		EXAMINER	
BANNER & WITCOFF LTD.,			SISSON, BRADLEY L	
ATTORNEYS FOR AFFYMETRIX 1001 G STREET , N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ELEVENTH FLOOR			1634	
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597			DATE MAILED: 10/28/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/755,028	LEVINE ET AL.				
Advisory Addon	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Bradley L. Sisson	1634				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresp ndence address						
THE REPLY FILED 14 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.				
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of reasons of record.						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>31-41</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other: B. S. Luion						
		-				

Bradley L. Sisson Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1634 Continuation of 2. NOTE: The deletion of identifiers of source of nucleic acid sequence effectively broadens scope of claim to encompass similar nucleic acid sequences found in any source. While the response of 10/14/2003 indicates that the original Figures provide support for this language, a review of the disclosure finds that each of the proposed amended sequence identifiers recites the sources sought to be deleted. Accordingly, the proposed deletion of language from the claims effectively broadens the scope to encompass embodiments not supported by the original disclosure.